15 T.C. 496 (1950)

Compensation received for damages to property leased to the government under threat of condemnation is considered an involuntary conversion and is taxable as a long-term capital gain, not ordinary income.

Summary

The Waggoners leased property to the U.S. Government under threat of condemnation. The government damaged the property during its lease term and paid the Waggoners compensation instead of restoring the property. The Tax Court addressed whether this compensation was taxable as ordinary income or long-term capital gain under Section 117(j) of the Internal Revenue Code. The court held that because the lease was entered under threat of condemnation and the payment was for damage to the property, the compensation constituted proceeds from an involuntary conversion, taxable as a long-term capital gain.

Facts

The Waggoners owned a property, Arlington Downs, which they initially leased for race meets but later used for horse training. In 1942, the War Department sought to lease the property for vehicle storage, threatening condemnation if the Waggoners refused. The Waggoners leased the property. During the lease, the government damaged improvements on the property. Upon termination of the lease, the Waggoners requested restoration as per the lease agreement. Instead of restoring the property, the government paid the Waggoners $22,442.50 in 1944 as compensation for the damages.

Procedural History

The Waggoners reported the compensation as a long-term capital gain on their partnership tax return. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue determined that the payment was ordinary income, resulting in a deficiency assessment. The Waggoners petitioned the Tax Court for review.

Issue(s)

Whether the compensation received by the Waggoners from the U.S. Government for damage to their property, leased under threat of condemnation, is taxable as ordinary income or as a long-term capital gain under Section 117(j) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

Yes, because the compensation received was a result of an involuntary conversion of property, it is taxable as long-term capital gain under Section 117(j)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code. The threat of condemnation leading to the lease established

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the involuntary nature of the conversion.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court reasoned that the key question was whether the property was involuntarily converted into money within the meaning of Section 117(j)(2). The court emphasized that the lease was entered into under the threat of condemnation. While the final agreement to accept monetary compensation was voluntary, it stemmed directly from the government's initial threat and the subsequent damage to the property during the lease term. The court distinguished this case from situations where compensation is received for the cancellation of a lease or settlement of a building covenant, noting that those cases did not involve an involuntary conversion of property. The court stated: "When so considered, it must follow, we think, that the petitioners' property which was damaged, destroyed, or converted while in the possession of the United States under the lease of July 17, 1942, was involuntarily converted into money, within the meaning of section 117 (j) (2), Internal Revenue Code."

Practical Implications

This case establishes that compensation for damages to property leased under threat of condemnation can qualify as proceeds from an involuntary conversion, leading to taxation as a long-term capital gain rather than ordinary income. This benefits taxpayers in situations where the capital gains rate is lower than the ordinary income tax rate. Attorneys should consider the circumstances under which a lease was entered, especially the presence of threats of condemnation, to determine whether compensation for property damage qualifies for capital gains treatment. The case clarifies that a subsequent voluntary agreement to accept compensation does not negate the involuntary nature of the initial conversion. Later cases will need to examine the direct nexus between the threat of condemnation, the lease agreement, and the compensation received to apply this ruling.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.